Case 2:16-bk-18163-RK Doc 87 Filed 10/25/17 Entered 10/25/17 14:23:37 Desc Main Document Page 1 of 2

1

2

4 5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

In re:

ANTHONY CURTIS WELLS,

1314

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2324

25 26

262728



## **NOT FOR PUBLICATION**

## UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA LOS ANGELES DIVISION

Case No. 2:16-bk-18163-RK

Chapter 7

o napto.

Debtor.

ORDER DENYING APPLICATION OF DEBTOR ANTHONY CURTIS WELLS AND PROPERTY OWNER SAYUN WELLS TO STAY LISTING AND MARKETING OF THE PROPERTY FOR SALE PENDING THE COURT OF APPEAL, SECOND DISTRICT'S DECISION IN DUMAS v. WELLS WITHOUT PREJUDICE

Vacated Hearing: Date: Octob

Date: October 31, 2017 Time: 2:30 p.m.

Courtroom: 1675

Pending before this court is the Application of Debtor Anthony Curtis Wells and Property Owner Sayun Wells to Stay the Listing and Marketing of the Property for Sale Pending the Court of Appeal, Second District's Decision in Dumas v. Wells ("Application") (Docket No. 81) filed on October 4, 2017. Richard K. Diamond, Chapter 7 Trustee filed an opposition (Docket No. 83) on October 17, 2017. Applicants filed a reply (Docket No. 84) on October 23, 2017. Gary A. Laff, of the Law Offices of Gary A.

Case 2:16-bk-18163-RK Doc 87 Filed 10/25/17 Entered 10/25/17 14:23:37 Desc Main Document Page 2 of 2

Laff, represents Applicants. Howard Kollitz and Aaron E. DeLeest, of the law firm of Danning, Gill, Diamond & Kollitz, LLP, represent the Trustee.

Having reviewed the Application, the Opposition thereto and related pleadings, the court determines that oral argument on the Application is not necessary, dispenses with oral argument, vacates the hearing on October 31, 2017, takes the Application under submission and denies the Application without prejudice. The reason for the denial of the Application is that although Applicants did not cite any legal authority in support of their Application, the court agrees with the argument of the Trustee that Applicants really seek injunctive relief to enjoin the Trustee's preparations for an eventual sale of the subject property, which is governed by Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 7001 requiring an adversary proceeding to "obtain an injunction or other equitable relief." See Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7001(7); see also, 10 Resnick and Sommer, Collier on Bankruptcy, ¶ 7001.02 at 7001-4 (2017)("Failure to commence an adversary proceeding when seeking the relief of the kind listed in Rule 7001 has resulted in the denial of the motion or dismissal of the proceeding."). The Application does not meet the procedural requirements of an adversary proceeding. See, e.g., Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7003 and 7004 (requiring filing of a complaint and service of summons and complaint). Denial is without prejudice because Applicants could commence a proper adversary proceeding for injunctive relief. No appearances are required on October 31, 2017.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: October 25, 2017

###

22

21

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

23

24

25

26

27

28

Robert Kwan

United States Bankruptcy Judge